



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,028	03/24/2005	Sarina Striem	800.1019	9002
23280 7590 03/20/2009 Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC 485 7th Avenue 14th Floor New York, NY 10018				
EXAMINER				
OH, TAYLOR V				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/20/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,028

Applicant(s)

STRIEM ET AL.

Examiner

Taylor Victor Oh

Art Unit

1625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/02/09 has been entered.

Non-Final Rejection

The Status of Claims

Claims 32-46 are pending.

Claims 32-46 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 32-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the brain ischemia treatment, does not reasonably provide enablement for the treatment or management of a metalloproteinase-related disease or disorder selected from cancer recited in claim 32.

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The scope of the claims is not adequately enabled solely based on the metalloproteinase inhibitor activity provided in the specification. The claims are directed to not the specific diseases, but all kinds of the diseases including any cancer by using the mechanistic nature of inhibiting matrix metalloproteinase enzymes. The specification falls short because data essential for treating many diseases by means of inhibiting matrix metalloproteinase enzymes is not described in the specification.

First, the instant claims cover the treatment of diseases such as, autoimmune diseases and cancer, for which there is no enablement provided.

The claim sets forth the treatment of cancer generally. However, there never has been a compound capable of treating cancer generally. There are compounds that treat a range of cancers, but no one has ever been able to figure out how to get a compound to be effective against tumors generally, or even a majority of tumors. Thus, the existence of such a "silver bullet" is contrary to our present understanding in oncology. Even the most broadly effective antitumor agents are only effective against a small fraction of the vast number of different cancers known. This is true in part because cancers arise from a wide variety of sources, such as viruses (e.g. EBV, HHV-8, and HTLV-1), exposure to chemicals such as tobacco tars, genetic disorders, ionizing

radiation, and a wide variety of failures of the body's cell growth regulatory mechanisms. Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body, and different vulnerabilities. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally, evidence that the level of skill in this art is low relative to the difficulty of such a task.

Further, "tumor" covers more than just cancers. It also covers many neoplasms, cancerous or not. A neoplasm is any abnormal tissue that grows by cellular proliferation more rapidly than normal, or continues to grow after the stimulus that initiated the new growth has ceased, or shows lack (partial or complete) of structural organization and/or coordination with surrounding tissue. It can be benign or malignant. Thus, such a term, also covers precancerous conditions such as lumps, lesions, and polyps. In addition, "tumor" covers things other than neoplasms. It also covers any kind of swelling arising from inflammation. Thus, the claim would cover treatment of many kinds of inflammation. The specification cannot support that.

When the best efforts have failed to achieve a goal, it is reasonable for the PTO to require evidence that such a goal has been accomplished, *In re Ferens*, 163 USPQ 609. The failure of skilled scientists to achieve a goal is substantial evidence that achieving such a goal is beyond the skill of practitioners in that art, *Genentech vs Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ2nd 1001, 1006.

The treatment of "autoimmune diseases" generally would be an unprecedented feat. For a compound or genus to be effective against "autoimmune diseases" generally is contrary to medical science. The "autoimmune diseases" are processes which can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms

that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There are dozens of such diseases, which have fundamentally different mechanisms and different underlying causes. Known autoimmune disorders include multiple sclerosis, autoimmune uveitis, rheumatoid arthritis, Addison's disease, thyroiditis, atrophic gastritis, myasthenia gravis, idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura, hemolytic anemia, systemic lupus erythematosus, primary biliary cirrhosis, Wegener's granulomatosis, polyarteritis nodosa, erythema nodosum leprosum, autoimmune uveitis, Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS), allergic encephalomyelitis, acute necrotizing hemorrhagic encephalopathy, idiopathic bilateral progressive sensorineural hearing loss, aplastic anemia, pure red cell anemia, polychondritis, scleroderma, Stevens-Johnson syndrome, idiopathic sprue, lichen planus, Crohn's disease, Graves ophthalmopathy, sarcoidosis, primary biliary cirrhosis, type I diabetes, autoimmune optic neuritis, uveitis posterior, or interstitial lung fibrosis, alopecia, Sjogren's Syndrome, Goodpasture Syndrome, Myasthenia Gravis, inflammatory bowel disease and many more.

There are both chronic and acute "autoimmune diseases", most of which lack satisfactory treatment. The intractability of these disorders is clear evidence that the skill level in this art is low relative to the difficulty of the task. Under such circumstances, it is proper for the PTO to require evidence that such an unprecedented feat has actually been accomplished. The failure of skilled scientists to achieve a goal is substantial evidence that achieving such a goal is beyond the skill of practitioners in that art, *Genentech vs. Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1006.

Since no compound has shown clinical efficacy against all autoimmune diseases, thus no *in vivo* or *in vitro* assay could be validated for the identification of such a general agent. Applicants' specification logically must lack such assay data.

In fact, there are four basic mechanisms underlying autoimmune disease: 1. Antibody mediated diseases: a specific antibody exists targeted against a particular antigen (protein), which leads to its destruction and signs of the disease. Examples are: auto-immune mediated hemolytic anemia, where the target is on the surface of the red blood cell; myasthenia gravis where the target is the acetylcholine receptor in the neuromuscular junction; hypoadrenocorticism (Addison's) where the targets are the cells of the adrenal gland. 2. Immune-complex-mediated diseases: antibodies are produced against proteins in the body. These combine into large molecules that circulate around the body. In systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) antibodies are formed against several components in the cell's nucleus (hence the anti-nuclear antibody test (ANA) for SLE). Most notably antibodies are made against the body's double stranded DNA, and form circulating soluble complexes of DNA and antibody, which break down in skin causing an increased sensitivity to ultraviolet light and a variety of signs. As the blood is filtered through the kidneys, the complexes are trapped in the glomeruli and blood vessels, causing the kidney to leak protein - glomerulonephritis. They also cause leakage in other blood vessels, and there may be hemorrhaging, as well as accumulating in synovial fluid and causing signs of arthritis and joint pain. Rheumatoid arthritis results from immune complexes (IgM class antibody called rheumatoid factor) against part of the patient's own immune system

(part of its IgG molecules). These form complexes that are deposited in the synovia of the joint spaces causing an inflammatory response, joint swelling, and pain. The collagen and cartilage of the joint breaks down and is eventually replaced by fibrin which fuses the joints - ankylosis. 3. Antibody and T Cell-mediated diseases: T cells are one of two types (the other being B-cells), which mediate immune reactions. Upon exposure to a particular antigen, they become programmed to search for and destroy that particular protein in future. Once a patient has been exposed to an antigen, he will be able to mount a much faster response to it the next time it encounters it. This is the basis of vaccination. Thyroiditis (autoimmune hypothyroidism) seems to be of mixed etiology. Several target antigens have been identified, including thyroglobulin the major hormone made by the thyroid. Auto-antibodies to antigens in the epithelial cells of the thyroid have also been found. The thyroid becomes invaded by large numbers of T and B cells as well as macrophages, which are cells that engulf and destroy other cell types. T cells specifically programmed for thyroglobulin have been identified. 4. Diseases arising from a deficiency in complement: When an antigen and antibody react they may activate a series of serum enzymes (the complement system) whose end result is either the lysis (breakup) of the antigen molecule or to make it easier for phagocytic cells like the macrophages to destroy it. Patients with deficiencies in enzymes activated early in the complement system develop autoimmune diseases like SLE.

Thus, with such differing mechanisms, it is not logical that a treatment for autoimmune diseases generally can be found.

In evaluating the enablement in question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Foman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

The Nature of the Invention

The nature of the invention in claims 32-37 , and 40-44 is a method for treating or managing a metalloproteinase(MMP)- related disease or disorder selected from cancer in a mammal comprising administering to the mammal in need a pharmaceutical composition containing a compound of the formula (I).

The State of the Prior Art

The state of the prior art is that according to US Patent No. 5,948,780, MMP inhibitors have been used to prevent and treat congestive heart failure and other cardiovascular diseases. Recent data has revealed that specific enzymes are closely related to some diseases ,while there is no effect on other diseases. The MMPs are generally classified based on their substrate specificity; particularly , the collagenase

subfamily of MMP-1, MMP-8, and MMP-13 selectively cleave interstitial collagen tissue. This has been noticed by the discovery that only MMP-13 is over expressed in breast carcinoma, whereas MMP-1 alone is over expressed in papillary carcinoma (see Chen et al., J. Am .Chem. Soc., 2000;122;9648-9654). Furthermore, according to Wo/01/63244A1 and US Patent No. 6,008,243 few selective inhibitors of MMP-13 have been approved.

Stable lipophilic diesters of the divalent metal ion chelator 1,2-bis(2 aminophenoxy)ethane-N,N,N',N'-tetraacetic acid (BAPTA) have been disclosed in the International Patent Publication No. WO 99/16741 of the same applicant. Also disclosed in this publication is the use of these compounds in pharmaceutical compositions useful for treating diseases and disorders related to excess of divalent metal ions. Among these diseases and disorders are ischemia, stroke, epilepsy and neurodegenerative diseases such as Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease.

; however, no selective or nonselective inhibitor of MMP-9 has been approved for treating any disease including any cancer in any animal.

The predictability or lack thereof in the art

The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below:

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that inhibiting the MMPs would result in only the specific sites of the

interstitial collagen tissue; this kind of treatment can not translated to all the possible treatment of any disease or any cancer in regards to their therapeutic effects.

Hence, in the absence of a showing of correlation between all the diseases claimed as capable of treatment by the compounds of formula I and the inhibition of matrix metalloproteinase, one of skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the claimed compounds of formula I due to the unpredictability of the role of inhibiting the MMPs, i.e. whether promotion or inhibition would be beneficial for the treatment of the diseases such as any cancer.

The nature of pharmaceutical arts is that it involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities. There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

The amount of direction or guidance present

The direction present in the instant specification is that the compounds of formula I can inhibit the MMPs which helps in the treatment for various diseases listed on page 8. However, the specification is silent and fails to provide guidance as to whether the diseases listed (page 8) require the inhibition of the MMPs for treatment, i.e. the specification fails to provide a correlation between the diseases listed and the inhibition of the MMPs. Also, there is no direction and guidance for the inhibition of the MMPs for the treatment of any kinds of diseases including any kinds of cancer.

The presence or absence of working examples

There are some conclusive statements for ameliorating disease and conditions related to peripheral inflammatory processes, usefulness in interfering with damaging neuron-inflammatory processes, and the neuron-protective effect for the brain ischemia in vivo test. Furthermore, there are not other working examples for any other diseases listed in the specification. Also, the compounds which are disclosed in the specification have no pharmacological data regarding the treatment of any other disease besides inhibitory activity of various MMPs using compounds from various classes and have no data on the possible treatment of the various diseases including any cancer that require the inhibitory activity of various MMPs. Also, the specification fails to provide sufficient working examples as to how the listed diseases can be treated by the inhibition of various MMPs, i.e. again, there is no correlation between the diseases listed and inhibition of various MMPs.

The breadth of the claims

The breadth of the claims is that the compounds of formula I can treat any disease by the inhibition of the MMPs, without regards as to the effect of the inhibition of the MMPs on the stated diseases including any types of cancer.

The quantity of experimentation needed

The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. One of skill in the art would need to determine what listed diseases would be benefited by the inhibition of the MMPs and would furthermore then have to determine whether the

claimed compounds would provide treatment of the disease including any types of cancer by the inhibition of the MMPs.

The level of the skill in the art

The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of the compounds of formula I for the treatment of any disease including any types of cancer by the inhibition of the MMPs. As a result, necessitating one of skill to perform an exhaustive search for which diseases can be treated by the compounds of formula I in order to practice the claimed invention.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2d 1001 , states that " a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search , but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable".

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and In re Fisher (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test which diseases can be treated by the compound encompassed in the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 32-39,44-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kozak et al (WO99/16741).

Kozak et al discloses the followings(see page 9 ,lines 15-26):



Formula 1

wherein the substituents on the aromatic rings are in the ortho position,
R is selected from the group consisting of $\text{C}_n\text{H}_{2n+1}$ ($n=1-10$), $\text{C}_n\text{H}_{2n+1}(\text{OCH}_2\text{CH}_2)_m$ ($n=1-20$, $m=1-6$), $(\text{C}_n\text{H}_{2n+1})_2\text{N}(\text{CH}_2)_m$ ($n=1-6$, $m=1-6$) and substituted or unsubstituted ArCH_2 ; and M denotes any physiologically acceptable cation.

The compounds of the invention may be useful in open heart surgery and for the treatment of medical conditions associated with increased levels of divalent metal ions, in particular calcium. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, brain and cardiac ischemia, stroke, myocardial infarction, epilepsy, chronic neurodegenerative diseases such as Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease and acute inflammation as well as diseases associated with neuronal and muscular hyperactivity such as urinary incontinence, prostatic hypertrophy, muscular spasm, arterial hypertension, asthma and irritable bowel syndrome.

(see page 12 ,lines 3-10).

However, the instant invention differs from the prior art in that MMP-related diseases or disorders selected from TNF-alpha mediated inflammation is unspecified.

Even so, many diseases such as brain and cardiac ischemia, neuronal and muscular hyperactivity diseases, and acute inflammation can be treated irrespective of never mentioning the use of the mechanistic nature of inhibiting matrix metalloproteinase enzymes for the treatment in the prior art. The acute inflammation in general may include TNF-alpha mediated inflammation. Furthermore, it is a well known fact that a similar chemical structure in the compounds gives rise to expectation of similar chemical properties. In re Gyurik, 201 USPQ 552(CCPA 1979) and In re May, 197 USPQ 601(CCPA 1978). Moreover, they are identical with each other with respect to their corresponding chemical formula. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan in the art to be motivated to research and discover the role of the mechanistic nature of inhibiting effect of the prior art compound on the matrix metalloproteinase enzyme in an alternative pursuit for treating those claimed diseases including TNF-alpha mediated inflammation by a routine experimentation.

Applicants' Argument

Applicants argue the following issues:

- a. The claims recite the treatment of MMP-related diseases or disorders selected from cancer and TNF-alpha mediated inflammation ,which is different from the prior art.

Applicants' arguments have been noted, but the arguments are not persuasive.

First, regarding the first argument, the Examiner has noted applicants' arguments. However, as indicated in the above, regardless of lacking in mentioning the mechanistic nature of inhibiting matrix metalloproteinase enzymes other than the elevated divalent metal ion the treatment in the prior art, the end result is still the same treatment for the same diseases of the claimed invention as described in the prior art (see page 12 ,lines 3-10). The acute inflammation in general may include TNF-alpha mediated inflammation. Furthermore, it is a well known fact that a similar chemical structure in the compounds gives rise to expectation of similar chemical properties. *In re Gyurik*, 201 USPQ 552(CCPA 1979) and *In re May* , 197 USPQ 601(CCPA 1978). Moreover, they are identical with each other with respect to their corresponding chemical formula. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan in the art to be motivated to research and discover the role of the mechanistic nature of inhibiting effect of the prior art compound on the matrix metalloproteinase enzyme in an alternative pursuit for treating those claimed diseases including TNF-alpha mediated inflammation by a routine experimentation.

Therefore, applicants' argument is not persuasive.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taylor Victor Oh whose telephone number is 571-272-0689. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Taylor Victor Oh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

3/16/09